(32)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (C) No. 2160 of 2007

Petitioners :
1. Zahoor S/o Tijau Aged-about 55 yrs. Caste - Gond
2. Alakhram S/o Tijau Aged-about 57 yrs. Caste-Gond
3. Bahoor S/o Tijau Aged-about 53 yrs. Caste-Gond
4. Harprasad S/o Kashiram Aged-about 52 yrs.
5. Harabai D/o Kashiram Aged-about 50 yrs.

All are R/o village-Rank P.H.No. 37 Tahsil-Masturi, Distt.-Bilaspur (C.G.)

Versus

Respondents :
1. Jaanaki Bai W/o Chhedi caste- Gond R/o village - Airamsahi, Tahsil - Masturi, Distt.-Bilaspur (C.G.)
2. Punnibai W/o Mangal singh R/o village-Parsadaa Silli, Haal Mukam-village-Rank, Tahsil- Masturi, Distt.-Bilaspur (C.G.)
3. State of Chhattisgarh, Through-Collector, Bilaspur (C.G.)
4. Sub Divisional Officer/Land Acquisition Officer, Bilaspur (C.G.)
5. Treasury Officer, Treasury office, Collectorate Branch, Bilaspur (C.G.)
6. Branch Manager State Bank of India, branch-Pali, Tahsil-Katghora, Distt.-Korba (C.G.)
7. General Manager N.T.P.C., Seepat, Bilaspur (C.G.)
8. Jeewan lal S/o Rambharose R/o Rank, Post-Koudiya, Distt.-Bilaspur (C.G.)

SB: Hon'ble Justice Shri Satish K. Agnihotri

Present: Mr. Sanjay Patel, counsel for the petitioner.
Ms. Deepali Pandey, Panel lawyer for the respondents No. 3 and 4/State.

O R D E R

(Passed on this 10th day of April, 2007)

1. By this petition, filed under Article 227 of the Constitution of India, the petitioner impugns the interim order dated 3.3.2007 (P/4) passed by the IIIrd Civil Judge, Class-I, Bilaspur in an application filed under Order VII

(33)

Rule 14 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 in pending Civil Suit No. 96 A/06.

2. The petitioner has filed a copy of 'Kisht Bandi Khatouni' after the stage of examining the witnesses produced by both the parties was over and the matter was listed for final argument. The petitioner has filed this application for taking the certified copy of the said document on record. At this stage, this cannot be entertained, as there is no opportunity to prove the documents, as examination is over. Even otherwise, there is no procedural irregularity in the order and it does not suffer from any infirmity, irregularity, illegality or procedural error to call for indulgence under Article 227 of the Constitution of India.

3. The writ petition is accordingly dismissed summarily.

B/-

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge